

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

DAVID GLENN WAITS,

Petitioner,

v.

MARION FEATHER,

Respondent.

No. 3:12-cv-01305-CL

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On January 30, 2013, Magistrate Judge Clarke issued his Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) [16] in the above-captioned case, recommending that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] be denied and that this case be dismissed. He also recommended that I decline to issue a Certificate of Appealability on the basis that petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Petitioner filed objections [20], and respondent chose not to respond.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to

make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the R&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the R&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Clarke's recommendation, and I ADOPT the R&R [16] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 3rd day of April, 2013.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Judge